

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

**GUAVA KIDS, LLC,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**GUAVA FAMILY, INC.,**

Defendant.

**MOSMAN, J.,**

No. 3:12-cv-01772-ST

OPINION AND ORDER

On May 21, 2013, Magistrate Judge Stewart issued her Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) [26] in the above-captioned case recommending that defendant’s motion to dismiss and alternative motion to transfer [11] be granted in part and denied in part. Judge Stewart recommended that the action be transferred to the United States District Court for the Southern District of California and that it be denied in all other respects. No objections were filed.

**DISCUSSION**

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or

recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Stewart's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R [26] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 11th day of June, 2013.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman  
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN  
United States District Judge